

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 7, 10-11, 13, 20-21, 24-25 and 27 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting. A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith to obviate this rejection.

Claims 32-35 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter and under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Economides et al. in view of Thomas et al. These claims have been canceled by this amendment, thereby obviating these rejections.

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Economides et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The specific portions of Economides et al. cited by the Examiner have been thoroughly reviewed, and it is respectfully submitted that Economides et al. does not teach a method of determining a configuration of a well as claimed in claim 1.

Rather, Economides et al. merely identifies various components of petroleum production systems and considerations to be taken into account in their design, and indicates that there is ordinarily only one optimum well trajectory (page 2, sixth complete paragraph). Economides et al. does not, however, disclose a coherent method for the selection of such trajectory, the type of interface between the reservoir and the wellbore, and completion equipment for installation in the wellbore, as is disclosed and claimed in the present application. Specifically with regard to page 119, paragraph 1 of Economides et al., which it is believed is asserted to disclose the selection of completion equipment for installation in the wellbore, this paragraph merely states that a means to eliminate sand production is desirable and lists a number of such means. It does not disclose a method to make a selection from among the various such means. Pages 224-227 of Economides et al. merely lists various completion components and characterizing equations for some of such

components, but again does not disclose a coherent method for determining a configuration of a well. It is submitted therefore that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-19 are allowable.

Claims 2, 7, 14, 20, and 22-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Economides et al. in view of Todd et al. (US Patent 6,745,159 B1). It is submitted that claims 2, 7, and 14 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim as noted above. The rejection of claims 20 and 22-28 is respectfully traversed. As noted above, Economides et al. merely identifies various components of petroleum production systems and considerations to be taken into account in their design. It does not disclose a coherent method for the selection of such trajectory, the type of interface between the reservoir and the wellbore, and completion equipment for installation in the wellbore, or an article comprising at least one storage medium containing instructions for determining a configuration of a well, as is disclosed and claimed in the present application. Although Todd et al. discloses an article comprising a storage medium containing instructions which, when executed, causes a system to perform desired functions to assist designers to perform their tasks, since Economides et al. does not disclose such instructions as disclosed and claimed in the present application, the combination of the disclosure of Economides et al. with the generic disclosure of Todd et al. cannot render the present invention as claimed in claim 20 and its dependent claims 22-28 obvious. It is submitted, therefore, that claims 20 and 22-28 are allowable.

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Economides et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Donovan et al. As noted, it is submitted that claim 1 is allowable for the reasons stated above and claims 3 and 4 are therefore allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Although Donovan et al. indeed discloses applications of multilateral wells, like Economides et al., it discloses none of the limitations of independent claim 1 from which claims 3 and 4 depend.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Economides et al. as applied to claim 20 and further in view of Todd et al. and Donovan et al. For the reasons stated above, it is submitted that claim 20 is allowable, and claim 21 is therefore allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claims 15-19 and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Economides et al. as applied to claims 1, 14, and 28, and further in view of Todd et al. and Thomas et al. For the reasons stated above, it is submitted that claims 1 and 20 are allowable, and claims 15-19 and 29-31 are therefore allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

It is submitted, then, that claims 1-31 now in the application are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2475.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 3, 2005



Wayne Kanak
Reg. No. 35,564
Attorney for the Applicants

Schlumberger
Gamma House
Enterprise Road
Chilworth Science Park
Southampton SO16 7NS
United Kingdom

44 2380 765512
44 2380 765505 (fax)